

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ARMANDO SERRANO-ESPARZA,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Case No. 8:11cr223

ORDER

This case is before the court on the defendant's Motion for Discovery (#33). On October 11, 2011 the plaintiff responded (#38) to defendant's motion for discovery specifically noting that the government would provide the defendant with a copy of the in-car camera video and audio of the traffic stop, that no records are known to the government regarding any certification of the working condition of the in-car camera video or audio, and that they have supplied through document Bates-stamp 52-56 information concerning Deputy Frye's education and training.

The court finds that delivery of the audio/video of the stop, as well as the other evidence, satisfies the government's discovery duties in this case. Specifically, no additional information as to the officer's education and training relating to drug interdiction and traffic stops need be produced as the officer is not being proffered as an expert, and no authority exists that would require the government to produce the information.

IT IS ORDERED: Defendant's Motion for Discovery (#33) is granted in part and denied in part as set out above.

Dated this 12th day of October 2011.

BY THE COURT:

S/ F.A. Gossett, III
United States Magistrate Judge

NOTICE

A party may object to a magistrate judge's order by filing an "Objection to Magistrate Judge's Order" within 14 days after being served with the order. The objecting party must comply with all requirements of NECrimR 59.2.